

**From:** Jason Zawacki  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/23/02 7:21am  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

I do not believe the proposed settlement will force Microsoft to turn to anti-competitive practices in order to sell their software. This case has been absolutely infuriating how Microsoft can put the same smokescreen (marketing) in front of the courts as it does to the general public. "Freedom to innovate", how, by limiting consumers so that all paths flow through Microsoft?

Some examples -

OEM deals where Windows must be installed on all new computers, and that no other alternative is allowed.

Consumers cannot request that a different OS (or no OS) be installed, and are automatically charged for the

Windows license. How is this not anti-competitive?

Windows XP - which is an operating system that brings MS a giant step closer to having complete integration with

MSN, with no other alternatives - can you replace MSN with AOL and get the same integration? No?

Then it

should be a separate product NOT integrated with XP. This would give AOL (and any other similar business) a fair

chance at attracting customers, where MS would have to market their merits of MSN vs AOL rather than winning by default.

Active Directory - The LDAP protocol is perfectly capable of handling anything AD can handle. But does MS use

LDAP (an open standard?) NO. It takes it, modifies it slightly so that all Windows installations MUST use AD and not

LDAP. This increases the realiance on Windows OS as well as AD products from Microsoft. 3rd parties have been

effectively cut out of providing an alternative to AD. Yes, there is Novell, but Windows will never be as tightly

integrated with Novell than it is with AD. So, once you've decided you like the features that AD provides, you have

NO CHOICE but to go with an all Microsft solution. How is this not anti-competitive?

Why must Windows update be run using Internet Explorer, and can never be run by any other browser?

(Since IE is

supposed to be JustAnotherBrowser) Why can't we use Netscape, or Opera to do the same thing?

In terms of security, it would be MUCH better if Microsoft was broken up. This would encourage LESS tightly

integrated products, which have been the main cause of almost all of the major virus outbreaks and

worms in the past year. The excuse Microsoft likes to use is that they are the biggest target, so people who want to cause damage are naturally going to go after them. This argument is flawed since the Apache webserver has nearly DOUBLE the marketshare of IIS (<http://www.netcraft.com/survey/>), and IIS is what has been the main target of those worms. Using MS's logic, if hackers wanted to cause the most harm, they'd target Apache and not IIS. So why have they targetted IIS? Because it is full of security holes, where Apache is not. IIS is the easiest target simply because of that, it is easy to exploit. Apache is an open source product which is open to peer review, where IIS is not. Coincidence?

And now look at their plans with the X-Box - All in one media center for the home, directly tied into MSN.

Passport - one stop personal info database (which has already been hacked into once). Potentially one of the most valuable databases ever created, call controlled by one essentially unregulated, company, Microsoft, who has a horrible security record.

Microsoft is continuing to make the US court system look foolish (at best) by brazenly ignoring warnings, continuing to tighten their stranglehold on the US business place while this case has been ongoing. Is this how the court system is supposed to work? Bend over backwards for companies that break the laws over because it is more convenient? Microsoft is at the forefront of changing this country into an Orwellian society (if you think I am exaggerating, then just look at the key positions Big Brother Microsoft has in the media today, and realize that the direction they are headed is to force all roads to lead to Microsoft.) If you think that they do not have the money and power to do this, then you do not realize the importance of this Anti-trust case.

Jason Zawacki

